UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,972	01/10/2001	Sandeep Jaggi	30454-00275	9634

24319 7590 03/08/2005		

LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
1621 BARBER LANE
MS: D-106
MILPITAS, CA 95035

EXAMINER
VAN DOREN, BETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3623	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*13 December 2004*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a Final office action in response to communications received 12/13/04.

Claims 1-14 have been amended. Claims 17-20 have been added. Claims 1-20 are now pending

in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 8 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grow

(U.S. 6,694,315).

4.   As per claim 8, Grow teaches a system for managing projects, comprising:

       a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3,

which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

       b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures

2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);

       c. means for determining a date (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10,

table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a date is predetermined);

       d. means for generating and electronically transmitting to a first individual of said

individuals, prior to said date, a first reminder to complete a task associated with the project (See

at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 20-41, 48-55, and 60-67, which discloses a reminder to complete the task); and

e. means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual and a second individual of said individuals, to whom the first reminder was not transmitted, a second reminder to compete the task (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator).

5.   As per claim 12, Grow teaches a system for managing projects comprising:

a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

b. means for associating a plurality of individuals listed in a first database with said project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project. See figure 2(a), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, which discloses a user table stored in a first memory table);

c. means for inputting a completion of a first task associated with said project in a second database (See column 8, lines 50-65, column 9, lines 15-30 and 45-67, column 11, lines 15-29, column 14, lines 35-65, wherein the completion of the first task (document in the legal proceedings) is inputted and the dates updated);

d. means for generating and electronically transmitting, responsive to the completion of said first task, an instruction to complete a second task to a first individual of said individuals (See figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a reminder is electronically

generated and sent for completion of a second task based on the indication of the critical date at

completion of the first task).

6.   As per claim 13, Grow teaches a system for managing projects, comprising:

        a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3,

which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

        b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures

2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);

        c. means for generating and electronically transmitting a plurality of first reminders to

complete a task associated with said project to a first individual of said individuals (See figure

2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines

10-23, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein reminders are sent); and

        d. means for generating and electronically transmitting a second reminder to a second

individual of said individuals that said task requires completion, wherein said second reminder to

said second individual is generated and transmitted after a predetermined number of said first

reminders have been transmitted to said first individual concerning said task (See at least column

18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator).

7.   As per claim 14, Grow teaches a system wherein said second individual is a supervisor of

said first individual (See at least column 18, lines 10-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second

reminder to a user and an administrator).

8.   As per claim 15, Grow teaches a system, comprising:

        a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3,

which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

b. means for associating a plurality of individuals with said project (See at least figures

2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are associated with the project);

c. means for determining a date (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10,

table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a date is determined);

d. means for automatically generating and electronically transmitting by a first mode to a

first individual of said individuals, prior to said date, a first reminder to complete a task

associated with the project (See at least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table

III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67,

wherein a first reminder is sent); and

e. means for automatically generating and electronically transmitting by a second mode

to said first individual a second reminder to complete the task associated with the project on said

date (See at least column 18, lines 10-25 and 55-67, wherein a second reminder is sent).

9.   As per claim 16, Grow teaches a system wherein said first mode is e-mail and said

second mode is voice mail (See column 17, lines 10-25, and column 18, lines 10-20, wherein the

modes of reminders are disclosed).

10.   As per claim 17, Grow teaches wherein said data concerning said project is stored in a

third database (See at least figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52,

wherein the third table can be stored in a separate, third memory).

11.   As per claim 18, Grow teaches teaches wherein (i) said individuals are listed in a first

database and (i) said data concerning said project is stored in a second database (See at least

figures 2(a)-(c), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, wherein individuals are list in

a first table stored in a memory location and project data is stored in a second table in a separate

memory location).

12.   Claim 19-20 recite equivalent limitations to claim 18 and are therefore rejected using the

same art and rationale applied above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Grow (U.S. 6,694,315).

14.   As per claim 1, Grow teaches a system for managing projects comprising:

a. means for inputting data concerning a project (See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3,

which disclose inputting data concerning a project);

b. means for associating a plurality of individuals listed in a first database with said

project (See at least figures 2(a) and 2(b), and column 4, lines 15-30, wherein individuals are

associated with the project. See figure 2(a), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52,

which discloses a user table stored in a first memory table);

c. means for determining a deadline for completing a task associated with said project

(See at least figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, wherein a

date is predetermined);

d. means for generating in a second database a first date prior to said deadline (See at

least figure 2(b), and column 12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column

17, lines 10-23, and column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, where a first date prior to the

deadline is set. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52, column 5, lines 60-67,

and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a case table is stored in a second, separate, memory table);

e. means for generating and electronically transmitting on said first date a first reminder

to complete said task to a first individual of said individuals (See at least figure 2(b), and column

12, lines 34-55, 64-67, and table III, column 13, lines 1-10, column 17, lines 10-23, and column

18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a first reminder is sent);

f. means for generating in a second database a second date that is before said deadline

but after said first date (See at least column 18, column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67,

wherein a second date is determined. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52,

column 5, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a second, separate, memory table);

g. means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual on said

second date a second reminder to complete said task (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55,

and 60-67, wherein a second reminder is sent);

h. means for generating in said second database a third date that is before said deadline

but after said second date (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a third

reminder date is determined. Figure 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 10-52, column

5, lines 60-67, and column 6, lines 1-17, discuss a second, separate, memory table); and

i. means for generating and electronically transmitting to said first individual on said third date a third reminder to complete said task (See at least column 18, lines 10-41, 48-55, and 60-67, wherein a third reminder is sent).

However, while Grow discloses sending a first and then multiple subsequent reminders, Grow does not expressly disclose that the number of days between said first date and said second date is greater than the number of days between said second date and said third date.

Grow discloses that a first reminder would be sent at a notification date prior to the critical date of a legal action. After this first reminder, a second reminder would be sent at a predetermined interval after the first reminder (i.e. second date). After this second date a third reminder would be sent again at a predetermined interval after the second date or a third reminder would be sent on the critical date. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the interval between the second and third date is shorter than the interval between the first and second date in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of sending multiple reminders.

15.   As per claim 2, Grow teaches wherein said deadline is a last day to respond to an action by a governmental agency without an extension (See figures 2(a), 2(b), and 3, and column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-45, column 11, lines 5-30 and 40-67, column 13, lines 1-10 and 35-40, wherein the deadline is based on a response to an action without an extension).

16.   As per claim 3, Grow teaches wherein said predetermined date is the last day to respond to an action by a governmental agency without an extension (See at least column 1, lines 45-67,

column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, and column 18, lines 20-40, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the governmental action is an office action issued by a patent examiner.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent. An office action is a well-known legal action in the patent field of law and it is further well-known that this action has a required deadline set by statutory law. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor office action deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing deadlines to the office action by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

17.   As per claim 4, Grow teaches a system wherein said predetermined date is a statutorily set deadline (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the statutorily set deadline is for filing a patent application.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent. It is well known that a patent application a required deadline set by statutory law (for example, the filing of an application within a year of disclosure of the invention, the filing of a non-provisional application within a year of filing a provisional, etc.). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor patent application filing deadlines in order to reduce the potential for missing filing deadlines by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

18.   As per claim 5, Grow teaches wherein said second reminder is also electronically transmitted to a second individual of said individuals who was not sent said first reminder (See at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, wherein a second reminder is sent to a user and an administrator).

19.   As per claim 6, Grow discloses wherein said third reminder is also electronically transmitted to a third individual of said individuals (See column 17, lines 10-25, and column 18, lines 20-30, wherein the administrator and other users are emailed). However, Grow et al. does not expressly disclose that the third individual was not sent said second reminder.

Grow discloses sending multiple reminder messages to one or more users and sending a message to an administrator when the previous reminder messages have not been answered. Grow also discusses the importance of reducing the potential of missed deadlines in lines 20-25

of column 17, thus the reasoning for requiring affirmative acknowledgement of the message.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to send the reminder message to a third, separate individual in order to increase the

redundancy of the system's reminders, thus decreasing the potential of a missed deadline by

making more people aware and responsible.

20.   As per claim 7, Grow teaches wherein said second individual is a supervisor of said first

individual (See column 18, lines 20-30, wherein the second individual is the administrator of the

first individual is emailed).

21.   As per claim 9, Grow teaches wherein said date is the last day to respond to an action by

a governmental agency without an extension (See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines

1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column 11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses

critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow discusses that the system would be tailored

to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow does not expressly disclose that the

governmental action is a United States Patent and Trademark Office action issued by a patent

examiner.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to

legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area

of practice of an attorney or agent. An office action is a well-known legal action in the patent

field of law and it is further well-known that this action has a required deadline set by statutory

law. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to

make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor office action deadlines in order to reduce the

potential for missing deadlines to the office action by sending automatic reminders to the person

in charge of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines

20-30, which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

22.   As per claim 10, Grow teaches wherein said date is a statutorily set deadline (See at least

column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, column 10, table 1, lines 15-25 and 38-55, column

11, lines 5-30 and 45-67, which discusses critical dates and extensions). However, while Grow

discusses that the system would be tailored to any area of practice of an attorney or agent, Grow

does not expressly disclose that the statutorily set deadline is for filing a patent application.

Grow discusses that the critical dates and notification dates stored in the system relate to

legal deadlines set with regards to legal actions and that the system would be tailored to any area

of practice of an attorney or agent. It is well known that a patent application a required deadline

set by statutory law (for example, the filing of an application within a year of disclosure of the

invention, the filing of a non-provisional application within a year of filing a provisional, etc.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to use the automated docketing system of Grow (that is applied in the legal field to

make legal deadlines) to docket and monitor patent application filing deadlines in order to reduce

the potential for missing filing deadlines by sending automatic reminders to the person in charge

of filing. See at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30,

which discusses the advantages of the system in the legal field.

23.   As per claim 11, Grow discloses a system further comprising means for generating and

electronically transmitting a reminder to said first individual and a second individual, to whom

the first reminder was not sent, a second reminder to compete the task (See at least column 18,

lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder to a user and an administrator). Grow

also discloses a system wherein a law firm with multiple lawyers is identified in the system (See

column 8, lines 10-40). However, Grow does not expressly disclose a third individual to whom

neither the first reminder or second reminder was sent or transmitting a third reminder to the

third individual.

Grow teaches a system where a reminder is sent to the individuals responsible for

completing a legal action and a subsequent reminder would also be sent to an administrator

associated with the individual to ensure the action is completed by the critical date. Grow further

discloses storing the members of a law firm together in the system. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to send a third

reminder to a third individual in the law firm in order to reduce the potential for missed deadlines

by sending multiple reminders close to the critical date of the legal action. See at least column 1,

lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and column 18, lines 20-30, which discusses this advantage of

sending multiple reminders.

Response to Arguments

24.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 12 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new grounds of rejection, as necessitated by amendment.

25.   Applicant's arguments with regards to Grow (U.S. 6,694,315) have been fully

considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks, Applicant argues that Grow does not

teach or suggest (1) means for generating and electronically transmitting to a first individual and

a second individual, to whom a first reminder was not transmitted, a second reminder to

complete a task and that the administrator is not a second individual, (2) as per claim 13, that the

second reminder is sent to a second individual after a predetermined number of first reminders have been transmitted to a first individual, (3) as per claim 15, transmitting by a second mode to a first individual a second reminder to complete a task on a determined date, (4) a first database listing individuals and a second database holding a date, and that (5) there is no motivation to modify Grow in claim 1.

In response to argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See column 18, lines 10-35, of Grow which discuss a second reminder being sent to a first user and a second user (an administrator) in order to reduce the potential of a missed deadline. Nothing in the claim language bars the second user from being an administrator. The administrator of Grow is a user who ensures that a deadline is met for the task and is a separate user from the first user and therefore satisfies a second user receiving a second reminder. See also column 3, lines 25-45, which discuss the administrator as a user of the host computer. Examiner further points out that Grow discusses the ability to send reminders to multiple individuals in column 17, lines 10-25.

In response to argument (2), examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first points out that the claim does not specifically state how many reminders "a predetermined number of reminders" and therefore, in the broadest reasonable interpretation, any number of reminders, such as one, two, fifteen, etc., would satisfy this limitation. Therefore, see at least column 18, lines 20-35 and 60-67, which discloses a second reminder being sent to an administrator when a failed reminder occurs with the first user.

In response to argument (3), Examiner respectfully disagrees. See specifically Grow, column 18, lines 10-20, wherein a second mode of transmission, such as telephone or facsimile, is relied upon to transmit a second reminder.

In response to argument (4), examiner respectfully disagrees. See at least figures 2(a)

and 2(b), column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 10-52, which discuss the different

arrangements of the memory and tables of Grow. Grow discloses a user table stored in first

memory and a case table stored in separate second memory, the case table containing

information concerning the dates associated with the case.

In response to argument (5), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed

invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347,

21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Grow discloses that a first reminder would be

sent at a notification date prior to the critical date of a legal action. After this first reminder, a

second reminder would be sent at a predetermined interval after the first reminder (i.e. second

date). After this second date a third reminder would be sent again at a predetermined interval

after the second date or a third reminder would be sent on the critical date. Therefore, since

Grow discusses the advantages of sending multiple reminders and also reducing the potential to

miss deadlines by sending reminders in at least column 1, lines 45-67, column 2, lines 1-7, and

column 18, lines 20-30, Grow does teach and suggest motivation to modify.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (703) 305-3882.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

bvd

February 22, 2005

TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600